

REGION VIII SUMMARY OF DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW

| Case No. <u>S'AS 2356 H</u> | Project No. |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Site Richardson Flats | |
| Contractor Laboratory Hittma | n Ebasco Assoc. |
| Data Reviewer <u>L. Roberts</u> | Date of Review 9/3/86 |
| Sample Matrix Celluluse Fili | ters |
| Sample No. See Lab | oratory Cover Sheet. |
| | |
| | |
| () Data are accepta | able for use |
| () Data are accepta | able for use with qualification noted above |
| () Data are prelim | inary - pending action or verification |
| () Data are unacce | ptable |
| Action required by DPO? | • |
| | owing items require action <u>Detection limits</u> |
| requested by region were | e not on et by the laboratory. |
| Action required by Project Offic | er (PO)? |
| No / Yes | |

Pollowing are our findings:

| Celluluse air fetters were submitted for analysis af |
|--|
| asenie, radmum, lead and yine. I his was a SAS |
| sequest. |
| The gaile recovery for carmium was 65%, The |
| radmin results, therefore, have been plaged with |
| an "R". The nine Loberatory Control Single recovery |
| Nevet was only 60%. The zine results may be |
| lined low and have been played as estimatel (I) |
| - Two agreets of the contract were not puffilled by |
| the laboratory. Detection limits of Ing/2 were |
| specifical by the SAS contract. However, the actual instrument |
| detection limits for As. Cd. Phand In where from |
| 3.8-4.8 ug/1. also, the RSO results for duplicate |
| furance injections were not reported. The duplicate |
| results appear to agree well, however. |
| |
| |
| |
| · |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

FORM A

Inorganic Data Completeness Checklist

| /_ | Inorganic analysis data sheets |
|----------|--|
| _/ | Initial calibration and calibration verification results |
| <u>/</u> | Continuing calibration verification |
| | Instrument Detection limits |
| | Duplicate results |
| | Spike results |
| | ICP interference check sample |
| | Blank results |
| NR | Serial Dilution Results |
| | Raw data for calibration standards |
| | Raw data for blanks |
| | Raw data for samples |
| <u> </u> | Raw data for duplicates |
| /_ | Raw data for spikes |
| | Raw data for furnace AA |
| NR | Percent solids calculation - soils only |
| | Traffic Reports |

| Initial calibration dat | were reviewed. Initial calibration data were |
|-------------------------|--|
| included in the package | and met all contract requirements. |
| YES | NO |
| Comments: | |
| | |
| | |
| | • |
| | |
| Continuing calibration | lata were reviewed and these data met all contract |
| requirements. | |
| YES | NO |
| Comments: | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| A blank was run with ev | ery twenty samples or less per case. |
| YES / | NO |
| Comments: | 2 |
| tuo prep Llanko we | e prepared |
| 7 * | |
| | |
| | |
| How many elements were | detected above the required detection limit? |
| | = 7 mg/L |
| Slack of | 7 4 30 7 6 |
| | detected at greater than one half the amount |
| detected in any sample? | |
| Comments: | , |

| massive interferences | were present. | |
|-----------------------|---|----|
| YES | NO | |
| Comments: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| All matrix spike requ | irements were met. | |
| | | |
| Comments: | n form were deposent to read and not initiale opiked, all recoveries were within 65-120% a pike recovery. | el |
| Conections made o | n form were with were within 65-120% | Ś |
| a clion felter was | spiked, all recovery. | |
| Calmium results an | e played du to a 65% spike reconery. | |
| | | |
| A duplicate sample wa | s run with every twenty or fewer samples of a | |
| similar matrix, or on | e per case, whichever is more frequent. | |
| YES | NO | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| The RPD's were tabula | ited. | |
| YES_ | NO | |
| Comments: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| All inorganic detecti | on limits met the contract requirements. | |
| YES | NO | |
| Comments: | a seal of the District dor | |
| SAS regions great | rich 1 mg/L detection terms for | |
| the four elevents. | The las did not reach there | |
| limits. | | |

FORM D

| All Laboratory Control Samples met specified contract limits. |
|--|
| Comments: Zine 60% Recovery - zine results estimated. LCS performed as required. |
| Serial Dilution requirements were met. YES |
| The Furnace Atomic Absorption Analysis Scheme was followed correctly. YES NO |
| All holding times were met. YES NO Comments: |

Form VII A

Q.C. Report Bo. __

INSTRUMENT DETECTION LIMITS AND

| | | Karel | t Doe) |
|---|--------------------------|---------|----------------|
| 8-14-86 | LCS UNITS | (MID) | mg/kg |
| EAD MANE BITTMAN EBASCO ASSOCIATES INC. | CASE NO. | KH 6191 | J356H |
| LABORATORY (| CONTROL SAMPLE CASE NO. | 1.018 | 15 22 C/ // |
| • | | | |

| Required Detection | | Instrument Detection | | Lab Control Sample | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--|---------|--------------------|--|----------|
| Compound | Limits (CRDL)-ug/1 | | | True Tound IR | | |
| | | ICP/AA | Furnace | 1100 | 4 | |
| Metals: | | 56.1 | | | | |
| 1. Aluminum | 200 | 36.1 | 7.5 | | | |
| 2. Antimony | 60 | | 4.8 | 20 | 21 | 105 |
| 3. Arsenic | 10 | | 4.0 | 120 | 021 | ,,,, |
| 4. Barium | 200 | 38.9 | | | 1 | |
| S. Beryllium | 5 | 1.8 | | 20 | 21 | 105 |
| 6. Codmium | 5 | 4.7 | | 1 20 | 101 | 100 |
| 7. Calcium | 5000 | 19.4 | | ļ | 1 | |
| 8. Chronium | 10 | | 1.9 | ļ | <u> </u> | |
| 9. Cobalt | 50 | 10.5 | | ! | ļ | |
| 10. Copper | 25 | 9.0 | | | <u> </u> | |
| 11. Iron | 100 | 29.5 | | <u> </u> | | - |
| | 5 | | 0.9 | 20 | 22 | 110 |
| 12. Lead | \$000 | 4.8 | 1 | | | |
| 13. Magnesium | 15 | 2.8 | | <u> </u> | | |
| 14. Kanganese | 0.2 | 0.106 CV | | | | |
| 15. Mercury | 40 | 4075 15 | | | <u> </u> | |
| 16. Mickel | | 20.3 | | | <u> </u> | |
| 17. Potassius | | | 1.1 | | | |
| 18. Selenium | 5 | | 0.34 | | | |
| 19. 811ver | 10 | 14.1 | | 1 | | |
| 20. Sodium | \$000 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| 21. Thallium | 10 | DX =-1 | 1.7 | 1 | 1 | |
| 22. Tin | 40 | +1.¥31 | | 1 | + | V |
| 23. Vanadium | 30 | 9.0 | | 20 | 121/ | 60 |
| 24. Zinc | 20 | 3.8 | | 100 | 124 | |
| Others | | | | ! | 1 | - |
| J | | <u> </u> | | | | 1 |
| Cyanide | 10 | | | <u> </u> | 1 | 1 |

REGION VIII SUMMARY OF DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW

| Case No. 62/8 | Project No |
|--|--|
| Site Richardson Flats | |
| Contractor Laboratory Hittman E | basco |
| Data Reviewer L Roberts | Date of Review 9/5/86 |
| Sample Matrix Soil - Inorgani | |
| MH0863 MH0864 | |
| () Data are preliminary () Data are unacceptable Action required by DPO? | for use with qualification noted-above y - pending action or verification |
| Action required by Project Officer (| PO)? |

regulants are our findings:

| والمرازية والمراجع وا | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | • |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | • * | •• | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Ω | | 0- |
| | - num | Luc Kup X | defount to rea |
| | | 7 0 0 | 7 7 11 |
| 200 S, I | was now of | Josephan 7- | opple knjou |
| | 4 | 1 0 | 7 |
| 94 8 | tobuscute 1 | and originable | herouse they he |
| | - | 1 | |
| s, I com | E actuated of | the submittee | rated of p |
| | · min | Trans 104 | found of pure |
| 0 | 7 | 0.9 | 7 |
| Sinstop | 2 Hot an in | and I maken | De, Co, 14, 5b |
| 0 | , , , , , , , | | 1 |
| sol dimer | enick deletion. | who glos | inter entitution |
| | | | |
| | | | 39 and 61%. The |
| Marine Day | - 43 mg by 1 | | sof green Odd |
| | | | |
| The duplinate | postero mos | 4 marcale a | way high this som |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | 1 | |
| ourie as | rature sails res | Hg and II M | timet. The As |
| | 4 | • | • |
| Latino 22 | E + oft Lum | socorresion Le | an A due to opiles |
| www salaris | Jos gonor 15 | | , 0 |
| La . O | 100 Al. 1000 | 4 0 - 7 95 | off of the |

FORM A

Inorganic Data Completeness Checklist

| | Inorganic analysis data sheets |
|----|--|
| | Initial calibration and calibration verification results |
| / | Continuing calibration verification |
| | Instrument Detection limits |
| | Duplicate results |
| | Spike results |
| | ICP interference check sample |
| _/ | Blank results |
| _/ | Serial Dilution Results |
| | Raw data for calibration standards |
| | Raw data for blanks |
| _/ | Raw data for samples |
| | Raw data for duplicates |
| | Raw data for spikes |
| | Raw data for furnace AA |
| | Percent solids calculation - soils only |
| | Traffic Reports |

FORM B

| | data were reviewed. Initial calibration data we | :Te |
|----------------------|---|-------|
| YES VE | age and met all contract requirements. | |
| Comments: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Continuing calibrati | on data were reviewed and these data met all cont | .ract |
| requirements. | | |
| YES | NO | |
| Comments: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | every twenty samples or less per case. | |
| YES | NO | |
| Comments: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| How many alements we | re detected above the required detection limit? | Ó |
| now many elements we | re detected above the required detection rimit. | |
| | | |
| * | re detected at greater than one half the amount | |
| detected in any samp | le? | |
| Comments: | , | |

FORM C

| The interference check sample was run twice per eight hour shift. No massive interferences were present. | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| Comments: | at malyred | |
| Yinal ICS fo | antimory was not analyzed | |
| All matrix spike requirem | ments were met. | |
| YES | NO | |
| Comments: | 1 179 | |
| | 67% | |
| Hg 150% | As, Hy & I result may be biased high | |
| se 55% | N 11. and of to result | |
| T1 218% | N play applied to result. | |
| Advoratory miscalculate A duplicate sample was ru | in with every twenty or fewer samples of a | |
| similar matrix, or one pe | er case, whichever is more frequent. | |
| 1 | NO | |
| The RPD's were tabulated. | • | |
| YES | NO | |
| Comments: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | : | |
| | | |
| ``` | limits met the contract requirements. | |
| YES | NO | |
| Comments: | <u>.</u> | |

| All Laboratory Control Sample | es met specified contract limits. |
|-------------------------------|---|
| YES | RO |
| Comments: | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Serial Dilution requirements | were met. |
| YES | NO . |
| Vocantte 2510% | |
| 50 34% V 68% Co 14% Be 12% | E play applied |
| Co 1410 Be 1210 K 15% | E play applied Asboratory declarat play data |
| K 7070 | |
| The Furnace Atomic Absorption | Analysis Scheme was followed correctly. |
| YES | NO |
| | |
| | |
| , | |
| | |
| All holding times were met. | |
| YES | NO |
| Comments: | |

| / Dabbiatory Control Dampie. | met specified contract imital |
|---|---|
| YES | ко |
| Comments: | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 0 1 7 7 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | |
| Serial Dilution requirements v | were met. |
| YES | NO |
| Fearlt > 1/0% V 68% | 1.0 |
| 60 14% Be 12% | E play applied Saboratory ded not play data. |
| K 15% | Saboratory der not play data. |
| X 1370 | |
| The Furnace Atomic Absorption | Analysis Scheme was followed correctly. |
| YES V | NO |
| TES | NO |
| | |
| | |
| , | |
| | |
| All holding times were met. | |
| YES . | NO |
| Comments: | |
| | |
| | |